

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Prior to this Submission, Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 14-15 and 48-50 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 14 were written in independent form. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner objected to independent Claim 14 for informalities, but would allow Claim 14 if rewritten to overcome the objection.

Please amend Claims 1, 5 and 14 as shown, and please add Claims 51-57 and cancel Claims 48-50. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 14-15 and 51-57 are currently pending.

In addition to the Examiner's objection to Claim 14 for informalities, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,792,351 to *Lutter*, and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) the Examiner rejected the following: Claim 5, as being unpatentable over *Lutter* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,681 to *Kiendl et al.* (hereinafter *Kiendl*), Claims 14 and 49, as being unpatentable over *Lutter* and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0191568 to *Breed*, Claim 15, as being unpatentable over *Lutter* in view of *Breed* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,107 to *Impson et al* (hereinafter *Impson*), and Claims 48 and 50, as being unpatentable over *Lutter* in view of *Breed* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,487 to *Nuesser*.

Regarding the objection to Claim 14, it was alleged that it is unclear whether the "at least one" extends to "a speed information" and "a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver, a gyro sensor and an electronic map". Since this recitation has been deleted from the claim in the amendments herein, it is respectfully asserted that the objection is moot and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicants respectfully disagree.

The vehicle management information in amended Claim 1 includes a routing condition for determining a vehicle suitable for routing the vehicle management information as well as at least one of vehicle position, direction, and speed information, in which the routing condition further includes a routing type for initiating one of a forward routing, a flooding routing and a broadcasting routing.

In contrast, *Lutter* discloses that the emergency message contains kinematic state information relating to the current location and the direction of travel of the emergency vehicle. The emergency message may also include a route map indicating the intended course of travel for the emergency vehicle. The kinematic state may include position, velocity vector, acceleration vector, range, angle, and heading information (see col. 4, lines 7-17). It is respectfully asserted that *Lutter* fails to teach at least the routing condition of Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Lutter* fails to teach each and every element recited in Claims 1, 4 and 9, and therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding the rejections involving Claims 5, 14, 15, 48, 49 and 50 under § 103(a), it is respectfully asserted that the foregoing distinctions outlined in regards to Claims 1, 4 and 9 also apply to these rejections, and that independent Claim 14 is distinct from the cited art for these reasons, since none of *Kiendl*, *Breed*, *Impson* and *Nuesser* cure the stated deficiencies in *Lutter*. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

As to the new claims, it is respectfully asserted that *Lutter* fails to teach at least collecting additional information of a driver's vehicle with an optional unit having a radar or a camera mounted on a source vehicle, recognizing a traffic accident of the driver's vehicle based on the collected additional information, and transmitting a vehicle management information message to nearby vehicles, as recited therein. *Kiendl*, *Breed*, *Impson* and *Nuesser* fail to cure

these deficiencies in *Lutter*. Early and favorable disposition as to these claims, therefore, is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 14, 54, and 56 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 4-5, 9, 15, 51-53, 55 and 57, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 4-5, 9, 15, 51-53, 55 and 57 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending, i.e. Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 14-15 and 51-57, are believed to be in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens, III
Reg. No. 51, 314
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210 E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475